

has already reported—as the reader will remember—that the plot in the rooms of the Amalgamated Textile Workers was that the “workers”—of “different nationalities”—would select the teachers. But watch him. He goes on. He says next:

“The radicals will select the teachers.”

Then all is lost. Then:

“Under the guise of teaching English, radical thoughts and doctrines can be promulgated.”

You can see. The teacher would give out the lesson: “The husband of the sister of the Congressman is the son-in-law of the profiteer and does not believe in the dictatorship of the proletariat.” What would the school authorities do?

The author begins to be appalled by it himself. He says:

“This appears to be a very supple scheme.”

But he goes to the mat with it. He downs it. Supple as it is, he wrenches its secret from it. And the plot is solved.

“Mrs. Borrowes,” says Mr. Andres, “seems to have fallen under the influence of the propagandists.”

Good Heavens! Of course! Those are the people who rescue all these plots. They come on in the second act.

In the first act everybody believes in Americanism. But then in the second act a fellow comes on with a hypodermic needle and mingles with the crowd. And then in the third act you find people believing in municipal ownership of gas-plants and in letting foreigners learn English from teachers of their own choosing.

But in the fourth act the expert in Americanism arrives from detective headquarters or the National Civic Federation. He lamps the hypodermic needle or book or leaflet in the stranger's pocket. He snatches it. He looks at it. It is an argument. He pales. With his powerful hands he shatters it to bits. He advances on the stranger. “I know how you won this woman—this poor woman—this lady.” His right fist flashes or flames out. The stranger falls asleep. “Leave him lay. He was a propagandist!” The stage is flooded with light. The whole cast assumes an expression of intelligence and perfect understanding, which communicates itself to the audience. Curtain—Columbia weeping repentantly in the arms of a clean upstanding opponent of compulsory health insurance.

It is a sure-fire play, but Mrs. Fernandez was a poor Columbia.

She objected to her lines, and she went and complained to the managers, in the Wool Council. So next we will study the behavior of great men in a great industry when confronted with a mishap in their practice of espionage. WILLIAM HARD.

Who Are the Conscientious Objectors?

THE conscientious objector has been one of the most discussed types of personality made prominent by the war. In mere quantity of words written about him one must go, for comparison, to the Legion of Honor or to those intrepid forerunners of attack, the “shock troops.” Yet in all the discussion that has centered about his head, there has been little if any attempt to present him in the light of impersonal observation and fact; for the most part, people have drawn their opinions from preconceptions or, at best, from evidence received at second-hand. It is now possible, however, to give the results of a scientific study of the intelligence of the conscientious objector, a study pursued by methods as free from personal bias as any method of human observation can be. The conclusions of this study lie buried in the archives of the War Department, whence I am able to rescue them by virtue of the official permission recently given to me to investigate conditions under which military prisoners were confined. In making the facts public, I believe that I am adding an important contribution to the body of knowledge necessary before one can adequately answer the question: Who is the conscientious objector?

In January and February, 1919, there were nearly five hundred conscientious objectors at the United States Disciplinary Barracks, or military prison, at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. It so happened that during those two months the Surgeon General's Office of the War Department conducted a class in “disciplinary psychiatry” at the barracks. One of the tasks of this class was to make a psychological and mental study of all barracks inmates.

Most of the officers who made this study were psychologists or psychiatrists in civil life and were, therefore, thoroughly competent to make it. They used the same methods that the army had used in its examination of drafted men; the tests employed were the same that had been so successfully applied to two million soldiers. These tests, comprising both the so-called alpha and beta groups, involved the use of concrete material and pantomime, as well as of printed matter, so that the results were independent of the tested person's acquaintance with the English language and even of his schooling. Before these modern measuring rods of intelligence a man stands intellectually naked. He comes to the examination with only such mental resources and equipment as his Creator endowed him with, plus those spontaneously ac-

quired powers that life itself brings; some of the best records have been achieved by men who had not completed the eighth grade. The purpose of the tests is to put men into one or another intelligence group. They furnish a "fairly reliable index," according to the description of them published for army officers, of a man's "ability to learn, to think quickly and accurately, to analyze a situation, to maintain a state of mental alertness, and to comprehend and follow instructions." Among their specific achievements, they have aided in the discovery of persons whose superior intelligence suggested their consideration for advancement; in forming organizations of uniform mental strength, where such uniformity was desired, and of superior mental strength, where superiority was needed; in selecting men for special assignments; in distinguishing the mentally slow from the stubborn or disobedient; and in discovering those whose low grade intelligence rendered them a burden to the service. So useful have they been found, and so trustworthy is the light they shed upon a man's general intelligence, that colleges and universities, notably Columbia University, have substituted them for the traditional entrance examinations that candidates for admission have heretofore been required to pass.

Seven ratings are ordinarily used in applying these tests. These ratings are based upon a scientific determination of the "mental age" corresponding to a given age in years, but the ordinary description of the ratings is better for our purpose. According to this, grade A includes those who possess "very superior intelligence"; grade B, "superior intelligence"; grade C+, "high average intelligence"; grade C, "average intelligence"; grade C—, "low average intelligence"; grade D, "inferior intelligence"; and grades D— and E, "very inferior intelligence". The ratings assigned to a "theoretical normal company" by army psychologists are as follows: grade A, 5 per cent; B, 15 per cent; C+, 15 per cent; C, 30 per cent; C—, 15 per cent; D, 15 per cent; D—, 5 per cent; and E, none.

The first result of the examination of Fort Leavenworth prisoners was to make possible a comparison between the main body of prisoners and the conscientious objectors. For purposes of tabulation, the objectors were divided into three groups, (1) objectors on political grounds, (2) objectors on religious grounds, and (3) a miscellaneous assortment comprising "objectors because of being alien enemies, of having alien enemy relatives, of non-citizenship, and other like draft irregularities." Two thousand four hundred and sixteen general prisoners were examined. Of these

6.8 per cent earned ratings in grade A. This is slightly above the record of the theoretical normal company. Of the political objectors examined, 39.3 per cent earned ratings in grade A; of the religious objectors, 12.8 per cent; and of the third group of objectors, 1.5 per cent. Thus, it will be seen that the group of political conscientious objectors at Fort Leavenworth contained, proportionately, six times as many persons of "very superior intelligence" as did the main body of inmates; that the religious objectors contained twice as many; and that the third group—composed largely of men only technically classed as objectors because they did not want to fight against their own countries or for other reasons—contained only one-fourth as many.

The comparison was extended to other army groups. Of approximately 20,000 white men drafted and sent to Camp Lee in one month, 3.8 per cent made grade A. Of 82,000 enlisted men, all literate, for whom ratings were tabulated, 6 per cent made grade A. Of over 3,000 sergeants, 21 per cent made grade A. And of 9,000 candidates for officers' training corps, 37 per cent made grade A. The showing of the political objectors is better than any of these, whereas the religious objectors excelled both the drafted and enlisted men but fell behind the sergeants and candidates for officers' training corps. Indeed, it is not until one comes to the commissioned officers of the United States Army that he finds the political objectors excelled. Of nearly 9,000 of these for whom tabulation was made, 48 per cent earned ratings in grade A.

The superiority of the commissioned officers is not without its flaw, however. A special study was made of those conscientious objectors who, at the time of the examination, had refused to do any work in the military prison. These men were "absolutists," who carried their opposition to military service to the farthest extreme. They were looked upon by most of the officers at Fort Leavenworth as incorrigible and contemptible persons, deserving the worst punishments that could be inflicted upon them. As a consequence, they spent consecutive weeks in solitary confinement, with their hands shackled to the bars of their cells for nine hours a day and with only bread and water for food, rather than yield their convictions in any degree. Of the seventeen political objectors in this group, 59 per cent earned ratings in grade A, excelling the group of commissioned officers of the United States Army by 11 per cent. The twenty religious objectors made a poorer showing. Ten per cent of their number earned ratings in the first grade, a slightly lower record than that which was made

by religious objectors who did not refuse to work.

To these figures it may be answered that a comparison based on one grade is no criterion of the general level of intelligence of the various groups. This is true. The criticism can be met, however, by combining the percentages of those who earned ratings in the first four grades, since those grades include all marked "average" or better. This gives the following table:

Groups Compared	Percentages showing "average" and better than "average" intelligence
Theoretical Normal Company	65
Approximately 20,000 white men drafted and sent to Camp Lee in one month	45.1
Enlisted privates, all literate,—82,936	68
Sergeants—3,393	95
Candidates for Officers' Training Corps—9,240	94
Commissioned Officers—8,819	97
Political Objectors—84	82.2
Religious Objectors—218	81.4
Objectors who were "alien enemies," etc.—135	27.3

Many people who were familiar with the kind of newspaper comment on conscientious objectors that was current during the war will probably be surprised to learn that fewer than eighteen per cent of political objectors and nineteen per cent of religious objectors fell below the "average" in intelligence. Moreover, those who did fall below earned ratings in grade C— or D, so that none of them had "very inferior" intelligence. The table shows that both political and religious objectors excelled their fellow-inmates at Fort Leavenworth, the white draft at Camp Lee, the theoretical normal company and the enlisted men; in other words, they excelled their own associates both in prison and camp. When the comparison is made upon the basis of the first four grades, the conscientious objectors are excelled by the sergeants, the candidates for officers' training corps and the commissioned officers.

Conscientious objectors in prison differed in no essential respect, so far as I know, from other objectors. True, they pushed their opposition to military service farther than others, but I think it would be false to assume any marked dissimilarity between the idealism of the two, between the integrity of their moral purposes or the quality of their mental attributes; many of those in prison, indeed, were members of the same religious sects as those who remained outside, or drew their opinions from the same social and humanitarian philosophies. It is not unlikely, therefore, that any deductions concerning the intelligence

of the one group would hold good for the other.

Another sidelight is thrown upon conscientious objectors by this study. Not long ago an army officer declared that when conscientious objectors were released from prison they would make "the worst possible kind of criminals." Unless this effect has been produced by their confinement itself, the statement may be dismissed as not true. A study of the previous delinquency records of barracks inmates showed that over 40 per cent of the main body of prisoners had been convicted for offences in civil life, largely drunkenness, disorderly conduct, etc. Only 6.7 per cent of conscientious objectors had been convicted for such offences. Moreover, over 10 per cent of the other inmates had served terms in prisons or reformatories for more serious offences, whereas only *six-tenths of one per cent* of conscientious objectors—two or three individuals at most—had served such terms. It does not seem likely that we need to fear much from the future criminal activity of conscientious objectors.

WINTHROP D. LANE.

Centralia

THE verdict of the jury in the trial of eleven I. W. W.'s at Montesano, Washington, marks the end of one chapter in the reign of lawlessness that culminated in the tragedy at Centralia on Armistice Day, November 11, 1919.

A parade made up of various civic and fraternal orders, and several divisions of ex-service men, was a part of the day's celebration. The parade marched north on Tower Avenue to Third Street where it turned and retraced its steps along the opposite side of the avenue. The Chehalis division of ex-service men had just crossed Second Street, and the front of the Centralia division had almost reached Second Street when the parade stopped. The newly opened I. W. W. hall was located on Tower Avenue between Second and Third Streets, about one hundred and fifty feet from the corner of Second so that when the Centralia division stopped, a part of it was directly in front of the I. W. W. hall.

In the twinkling of an eye, doors are smashed, windows crash, shots are fired, men fall dead or wounded, and the crowd is scattered in every direction. To tell what actually happened and the order of occurrence required nearly three hundred witnesses in the trial just closed, and the testimony was so hopelessly in conflict on important points that there are wide differences of opinion still. The state contended that the parade, in making the turn on Tower Avenue, became somewhat disorganized